

1. I believe that your decentralization concept is basically sound. Other Offices, such as OL, OS, and OF have done this for some years in order to move logistics, security, and finance closer to the customers they support. The important aspect of decentralization is the line of control back to the cognizant office, i.e., D/OIT and OIT senior manager control of basic direction and policy of ADP/Office Automation on Agency-wide basis. While your draft alludes to this by making each affected DA Office ADP effort to be managed by an MZ careerist, I believe the "line" between this Office ADP manager and OIT will have to be clearly established. If not, the same result may be expected as we see today between OC and Chief, Telecommunications Division, OD&E. Additionally, I believe you should insist that the Office ADP manager should be integrated into the particular office management structure at no less than a staff chief reporting at the Deputy Director level. It would be a grave mistake, in my opinion, to have the ADP effort relegated to a support or administrative staff under the direction of some MG careerist. Therefore, your Office ADP managers should all be at the SIS level.

Kalpi

2. Your draft points out two exceptions to programs not to be decentralized: Corporate Data and overseas systems development. The first mention of this is in paragraph 6 and has a penned-in addition to include systems development "for the However, this change is not carried throughout the paper where "overseas development" is again mentioned, i.e., paragraph 8, first sentence; paragraph 8, fourth sentence; and paragraph 11, third sentence. I suggest that you include a stronger and more defined reference to our development charter for foreign field. In this same vein, I remind you that DFG also has a current charter for the installation and maintenance ADP/Office Automation Systems, be it CRAFT for the DO or ADP/OA for the DA, DI, or DS&T. I assume that you are NOT including this effort for decentralizing to the customer office. Also, I am not certain if

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1

you desire the [] mission to be decentralized to the various offices or not. I do believe this would be a mistake since most

25X1

[] customers want their office automation systems placed "on-line" through secure telecommunications with Headquarters. Since we have the "centralized" telecommunications charter, we should also keep the OSS concept centralized. The

25X1

[] relationship is starting to mature to a point where we are really going to benefit some customers. The recent effort for the Commercial Systems Audit Division of OF, tying together PCs [] locations with []

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

[] is an example. Next comes an effort with [] to possibly replace the Alliance with VS and place on-line [] An additional benefit of keeping OSS centralized is the mixing of MC and MZ cultures that is taking place between our people.